

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: "Tushar P. Dandade" <tushar1@worldnet.att.net>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/27/97 2:09am
Subject: ruling

96-128

Just to let you know that I do not agree with the rulings on 800 number access charges. I affects my skytel pager usage in a manner that it is now very expensive for its use.

Tushar Dandade
El Paso, TX

RECEIVED

NOV 28 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

File of Copies held
10-A-00000

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: <KMA61771@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/27/97 12:53pm
Subject: Payphone Charges

96-128

RECEIVED

NOV 28 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

I feel that this new 800/888 \$.30 charge for payphone users is ridiculous!!

The companies that own these payphones charge unbelievable amounts to us the users. Now because of AT&T, MCI, Sprint and all the other long distance companies out there that offer us lower calling rates whether it's local or long distance by dialing their specific 800/888 number, we have to pay!

The companies that privately own these payphones that are complaining, should either go out of business or be put out of business!!

I guarantee that I will never use a private payphone again!! And in my line of work, that is almost impossible!! I'm sure that the payphones that AT&T, Sprint and any others out there that aren't privately owned will be utilized by me!!

There's no way I'm ever going to pay \$.30 per call to a "FREE" phone number!

These numbers were set up just for this reason!! These small private companies can go bankrupt for all I care!!

Keith Alexander
Toledo, Ohio

2

ALL INFORMATION CONTAINED
HEREIN IS UNCLASSIFIED

From: <sam@ameritel.us.com>
To: KAF <KFugere@GMSSR.com>
Date: 11/27/97 7:25am
Subject: Re: Pay Station Service Charge

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

96-128

Katherine:

Thanks for your response. Tom M., Jim Smith, John LaRue and I met with one of the commissioners about this about 1 or 2 years ago, so I thought you folks would like a copy of the letter.

It is not so much the money we have to pay, and, as you point out, collect from our customers. It is the fact that we are so small that we may be getting bills for \$.284 from dozens or scores of payphone owners. If we don't spend the "big bucks" to use a clearing house, we will spend the rest of our days writing small checks. That is the part that is so frustrating. The bookkeeping of this is so far out of proportion in relationship to the benefit, it is insane.

Of course, the other frustrating thing is that even if we do bill our customers, they think it is WE who are getting the money, and we end up getting blamed for "lining our pockets". And the monopolies - who own the lion's share of the payphones, and are certainly the biggest beneficiaries of this ruling - once again walk off as the innocent ones.

Sam Medina
Ameritel
Napa, CA

CC: A4.A4(FCCINFO)

RECEIVED

NOV 28 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: <barrygaliger@juno.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/28/97 3:34pm
Subject: Compensation to PCP's for calling cards, etc.

96-128

PCP's are already over compensated for their services - because they create unreasonably small zones that can be called from their phones for standard charges which makes those who don't have any choice in phone service have to pay for toll charges. Add to this the number of places that use automated switchboards and answering devices that prevent travelers from being able to even leave a message.

There are many who travel that are being forced to pay for service that still fails to get their calls through to the intended party. This is going to force more and more people to go to exclusive use of mobile equipment - further overburdening a system that already has problems - and still has inadequate security.

My company provides toll free numbers to our customers to use without a charge to them - at a level which we have determined is within our marketing cost. Adding an additional \$.35 to many of these calls is not what we contracted for and seems to be the direction that this is heading. All types of carriers have been licensed to make what we consider excess profit. No such guarantee is given in our business or most others that we know of. It should be requisite upon the providers to make their product (Pay phone Service) attractive to users - instead of a penalty for doing business with them. We refuse to patronize hotels that make surcharges for phone use and the PCP's would learn that they are responsible for eliminating a sizable part of their market if they push this action.

I have already experienced several PCP's equipment in airports, etc. that insists on being paid the \$.35 to place even a toll free number and does not refund the money - even if the call is not completed. The PCP's need to be forced to deliver the service that they were authorized - not insist on further charges for their greed!

RECEIVED
NOV 28 1997
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

2

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: Jerry S Gilstrap <gilstrap_jerry@juno.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCINFO)
Date: 11/28/97 2:43pm
Subject: Doc# 96-128

96-128

I really feel that the imlementation of this bill is unfair. There should be no surcharge for calling and 800 number from a pay phone. We live in our motorhome and travel the U.S. and have to communicate thru payphones to leave messages or retrieve message. We use a message service to receive our messages and have to use a pay phones to retrieve our messages. The added charge of 24.6 cents has added to our monthly budget. We paid extra for a 800 number at our message service provider and buisness pay extra for 800 numbers. It appears our goverment is trying to gouge the last cent out of us just because we use a pay phone. Please reverse this bill for goodness sakes.

Thank You
Jerry S Gilstrap
101 Rainbow Dr Apt 6373
Livingston, Tx 77351

RECEIVED

NOV 28 1997

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

2
11/28/97
11/28/97